

REMARKS

Claim 5 is pending in the application upon entry of this amendment. Claim 5 is amended to independent form. Claims 1-4 and 6-8 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

I. REJECTION OF CLAIM 5 UNDER 35 USC §103(a)

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) based on *Chang* in view *Smith et al.* Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claim 5 defines a method for manufacturing a linear motor device whereby first and second clamping members are coupled together with a gap provided between the first and second outer yoke blocks. Such features are useful in providing better construction of the linear motor device compared to conventional techniques.

For example, the present specification describes how the outer yoke blocks 4a and 4b are connected to each other with a gap provided therebetween. The gap between the outer yoke blocks 4a and 4b preferably is set approximately not more than 0.2 mm (preferably, approximately 0.1 mm) in the exemplary embodiment, which can prevent degradation in magnetic property of the linear motor device 1. The outer yoke blocks 4a and 4b in the exemplary embodiment are connected together with a weld 7 as shown in Fig. 4 with a gap provided therebetween. When alternating current is applied to the linear motor device, chatter is avoided which otherwise can be present in a conventional linear motor device which does not include such gap. By avoiding such chatter, the present invention may avoid degradation of the linear motor device compared with conventional devices. (See, e.g., Spec., p. 10, ln. 23 - p. 11, ln. 8).

In rejecting claim 5, the Examiner refers to *Chang* as teaching a gap (400 in edited Fig. 2) provided between first and second yoke blocks (22a, Fig. 2). (See, O.A., p. 7). Applicants acknowledge that *Chang* teaches an opening between blocks 22a on

the inner part of the stator. However, applicants respectfully submit that such opening does not represent a gap provided between the first and second outer yoke blocks coupled together as defined in the present application.

It is known that the applicant may be his or her own lexicographer. As the term "gap" is used in the present application, the gap is the narrow (e.g., 0.1 mm) gap between the first and second outer yoke blocks 4a and 4b which avoids the problem of chatter. (See, e.g., Spec., p. 10, ln. 23 - p. 11, ln. 8). On the other hand, the opening between the first and second outer yoke blocks is represented by the "open ends of [the] outer yoke blocks 4a and 4b opposed to each other". (See, e.g., Spec., p. 10, lns. 14-16).

Consequently, based on applicant's definition of the terms as used in the specification and claims, *Chang* does not teach or suggest the elements recited in claim 5. The gap 400 (edited Fig. 2) in *Chang* to which the Examiner refers can not constitute the claimed gap provided between the first and second outer yoke blocks, as such an interpretation would be inconsistent with the applicants clear use of the term as in the present application. Rather, the gap 400 to which the Examiner refers in actuality is the "open ends" of the blocks 22a so as to be consistent with the terminology used in the present application.

As previously noted, the applicant is his or her own lexicographer. According to the meaning of the terminology in the present application, the opening 400 in *Chang* corresponds to the "open ends" of the blocks 22a. The opening 400 is consistent with the open ends of the outer yoke blocks 4a and 4b. *Chang* does not teach or suggest a gap provided between the first and second outer yoke block 4a and 4b consistent with the terminology used in the present application.

Smith et al. does not make up for the above-discussed deficiencies in *Chang*. Applicant therefore respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 5.

II. CONCLUSION

For at least the above reasons, claim 5 is believed to be allowable and the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone interview would be helpful to facilitate favorable prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Should a petition for an extension of time be necessary for the timely reply to the outstanding Office Action (or if such a petition has been made and an additional extension is necessary), petition is hereby made and the Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees (including additional claim fees) to Deposit Account No. 18-0988.

Respectfully submitted,

RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP

/Mark D. Saralino/

Mark D. Saralino

Reg. No. 34,243

DATE: March 5, 2008

The Keith Building
1621 Euclid Avenue
Nineteenth Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44115
(216) 621-1113